



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/099,777	03/14/2002	William B. Brown	AUS920010866US1	4836

7590 10/14/2005  
Mr. Volel Emile  
P.O. Box 202170  
Austin, TX 78720-2170

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, CAM LINH T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2161

DATE MAILED: 10/14/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

**MAILED**

OCT 14 2005

Technology Center 2100

**BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS  
AND INTERFERENCES**

Application Number: 10/099,777  
Filing Date: March 14, 2002  
Appellant(s): BROWN ET AL.

---

Volel Emile  
For Appellant

**EXAMINER'S ANSWER**

This is in response to the appeal brief filed 9/20/2005 appealing from the Office action mailed 3/8/2005.

**(1) Real Party in Interest**

A statement identifying by name the real party in interest is contained in the brief.

**(2) Related Appeals and Interferences**

Art Unit: 2161

The examiner is not aware of any related appeals, interferences, or judicial proceedings which will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the Board's decision in the pending appeal.

**(3) Status of Claims**

The statement of the status of claims contained in the brief is correct.

**(4) Status of Amendments After Final**

The appellant's statement of the status of amendments after final rejection contained in the brief is correct.

**(5) Summary of Claimed Subject Matter**

The summary of claimed subject matter contained in the brief is correct.

**(6) Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal**

The appellant's statement of the grounds of rejection to be reviewed on appeal is correct.

**(7) Claims Appendix**

The copy of the appealed claims contained in the Appendix to the brief is correct.

**(8) Evidence Relied Upon**

6,275,953

VAHALIA

8-2001

**(9) Grounds of Rejection**

The following ground(s) of rejection are applicable to the appealed claims:

Claims 1 – 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by Vahalia et al (U.S. 6,275,953).

◆ As per claims 1, 6, 11, 16,

Art Unit: 2161

Vahalia discloses a method, a computer program product (Fig. 7, 9, 25) of exporting file systems comprising the steps of:

- “Consulting a file associated with a mount point of a mounted file system to retrieve needed information to export the file systems, the mount point being the point at which the file systems are mounted on a computer system” See col. 13, lines 19 – 26. Vahalia teaches that the files are organized in a directory structure and also included mount points (col. 10, lines 55, col. 17, lines 18 - 23).

Vahalia also teaches that the file name is searched in the directory structure (col. 13, lines 34 – 39). The mount point can be attached into the directory structure, so that the tree is traversed from the root to the file to be accessed (col. 13, lines 51 – 55). Therefore, the file that located in the directory tree structure corresponds to the “file associated with the mount point”.

“The mount point being the point at which the file systems are mounted on a computer system” See col. 13, lines 1 – 3.

- “Exporting the file systems” See col. 13, lines 55 – 58.

♦ As per claims 2, 7, 12, 17, Vahalia discloses:

- “ The method of claim 1 wherein the needed information is names of devices within which the file systems are located” Some of the information stored in the data mover are the Network IP address, remote file system, which can recognize the client device (See Fig. 11, Fig. 33, and corresponding text)

♦ As per claims 3, 8, 13, 18, Vahalia discloses:

- “ The method of claim 2 wherein the file systems are exported without first being mounted” Vahalia teaches that to reduce the loading of the cached disk storage, the data

Art Unit: 2161

mover have a local file directory, which can reference to other storage. Therefore, the files are exported without first being mounted.

♦ As per claims 4, 9, 14, 19, Vahalia discloses:

- “The method of claim 3 wherein the file is an extended attribute file” As specified in the disclosure, page 15, the extended attribute file is a link that link to other directory and contains information to export the pathname of the other file system. The node that references to other node also is a link that can reference to other location (col. 17, lines 15 – 23).

♦ As per claims 5, 10, 15, 20, Vahalia discloses:

- “The method of claim 4 wherein each mount point has an extended attribute file” col. 17, lines 15 – 23.

#### **(10) Response to Argument**

***♦ In the Appeal Brief filed 9/20/2005, Appellant argues that Vahalia et al does not teach, show or suggest a method of exporting file systems (see page 5 of the Appeal Brief). The Examiner respectfully disagrees.***

Referring to Fig. 8, element 98, Vahalia discloses a method for exporting a file to the client(s) (See col. 13, lines 51 – 64, col. 14, lines 11 – 15 of Vahalia) as claimed in the invention.

***♦ In the Appeal Brief filed 9/20/2005, Appellant argues that Vahalia et al does not teach, show or “consulting a file associated with a mount point of a mount file system to retrieve***

Art Unit: 2161

*information needed to export file systems” (see page 7 of the Appeal Brief). The Examiner respectfully disagrees.*

Vahalia teaches that the files are organized in a directory structure (col. 10, lines 55, col. 17, lines 18 – 23) and also included mount points (col. 13, lines 1 - 3).

Vahalia also teaches that the file name is searched in the directory structure (col. 13, lines 34 – 39). The mount point can be attached into the directory structure, so that the tree is traversed from the root to the file to be accessed (col. 13, lines 51 – 55). Therefore, the file that located in the directory tree structure corresponds to the “file associated with the mount point”. When the system traverses the directory tree it must consult the plurality of files that associated with the mount point.

**(11) Related Proceeding(s) Appendix**

No decision rendered by a court or the Board is identified by the examiner in the Related Appeals and Interferences section of this examiner’s answer.

For the above reasons, it is believed that the rejections should be sustained.

Respectfully submitted,

Nguyen, Cam Linh

Art Unit 2161

LN

Art Unit: 2161

Conferees:

Hosain Alam

SPE – Art Unit 2166

  
HOSAIN ALAM  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

  
CHARLES RONES  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

Rones Charles

SPE- Art Unit 2164